Appl. No. 10/782,966 Amendment filed May 6, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 11-13 and 15 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 14 and 16 have been amended and new claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claims 14, 16, 17 and 18 are pending.

DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims with respect to "the flow path provided with a flow adjusting mechanism (claim 15)" and "the fluid introduced into said gap portions is exhausted therefrom into a gas path of said gas turbine (claim 16)".

In response to the drawing objections, Applicants have canceled claim 15.

With respect to claim 16, however, claim 16 has been amended to define a "gas flow path" instead of "gas path".

The "gas flow path" now referred to is shown by the numeral 6a in Fig. 1. The gas flow path 6a is identified in the specification at page 5, lines 17-20. The gas flow path 6a is further identified at page 6, lines 24-26. With specific

Appl. No. 10/782,966 Amendment filed May 6, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

regard to the "fluid introduced into said gas gap portions is exhausted therefrom into a gas flow path of said gas turbine", this is described in the specification at page 14, lines 8-10 as follows:

"Then, the compressed air pass through the slit 89 and discharged into the gas flow path 6a through the cavity 90".

Thus, the compressed air is "the fluid" in claim 16, and "a gas path" is the gas flow path 6a as shown in Fig. 1. The remaining part of claim 16 is shown in Fig. 2.

Accordingly, it is not believed that any further amendments to the drawings are required.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 14-16 were objected to because they improperly depended from canceled claim 1. Claim 15 has been canceled and claims 14 and 16 have been amended to be independent.

Each of these claims should originally have been dependent from claim 11 rather than claim 1. It is submitted that these claims are therefore now allowable.

Appl. No. 10/782,966 Amendment filed May 6, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carreno et al, U.S. Patent 5,593,274 in view of Suenaga et al, U.S. Patent 5,795,130 and claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama et al, U.S. Patent 6,334,756 in view of Suenaga et al.

Claims 11-13 have been canceled and therefore require no further comment.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 17 and 18 have been added in which claim 17 is claim 12 plus claim 14 and claim 18 is claim 13 plus claim 14. Since claim 14 was considered to be patentable, it is submitted that new claims 17 and 18 are also patentable since they incorporate the limitations of claim 14.

Docket No. NIP-149-05

Appl. No. 10/782,966 Amendment filed May 6, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks,

Applicants contend that this application is in condition for

allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination are
respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1417.

Respectfully submitted,

Gene W. Stockman

Registration No. 21,021 Attorney for Applicant

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370 Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (703) 684-1120

Date: May 6, 2005